

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/810,374	03/15/2001	Walter Winkler	1020843-991180	8757
26379	7590 01/06/2004		EXAM	INER
GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP 2000 UNIVERSITY AVENUE			FOX, CHARLES A	
E. PALO ALTO, CA 94303-2248			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3652	

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
•	09/810,374	WINKLER, WALTER	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles A. Fox	3652	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rill f NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions are period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stated and the period for reply will be peri	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of this od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become Al	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26</u>	September 2003.		
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ Th	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice unde			
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-14 and 16-20</u> is/are pending in th	ne application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	rawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2,4-8,10,12,14,17 and 18</u> is/are rej	ected.		
7) Claim(s) <u>3,9,11,13,16,19 and 20</u> is/are object	cted to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2003 i	is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)[objected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	he drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ection is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)	
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. △ Certified copies of the priority docume 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome since a specific reference was included in the 37 CFR 1.78. a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language p 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome reference was included in the first sentence of	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have beer eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). ist of the certified copies not estic priority under 35 U.S.C. first sentence of the specific provisional application has be estic priority under 35 U.S.C.	received. § 119(e) (to a provisional application or in an Application Data Sheeleen received. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific	et.
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) 🔲 Notice of	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 11-03) Application/Control Number: 09/810,374

Art Unit: 3652

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed October 27, 2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each document listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information therein which has been lined through has not been considered. All initialed documents have been considered.

Claim Objections

Claims 3,911,13 and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claim was not included in the latest amendment and there is no indication that the claim has been cancelled. Appropriate correction is required. Claims 3, 9, 11, 13 and 16 must be presented or cancelled in response to this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "ergonomically advantageous" is not properly defined as this height would be different for each user of the device. Individuals may change the settings as needed, but only after a setting based on the quantity of articles on the retrieval pallet is determined. Therefore it is indeterminate as to how the

Application/Control Number: 09/810,374

Art Unit: 3652

ergonomic advantageous retrieval height is established. In the below rejection of claim 14 the ergonomic advantages of the device are not treated as they are not defined.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 2,4-8,10,12,14,17 and 18 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,24,27,28,31-36, 38 42 and 44 of U.S. Patent No. 6,602,037. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the limitations of independent claim 14 in the instant invention are all present in claim 27 and the claims from which it depends of U.S. Patent No. 6,602,037. The dependent claims in the instant application are nearly word for word copies of the dependent claims from the above mentioned U.S. Patent. The table below list the matching of the claims in regards to this rejection.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/810,374

Art Unit: 3652

Claims in instant application	Matching claims in US 6,602,037	
14	1,24,27	
2,4	28	
5	31	
6	32	
7	33	
8	34	
10	36	
12	38	
17	42	
18	44	

Response to Amendment

Amendment C filed on September 26, 2003, has been entered into the record.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 14 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 09/810,374

Art Unit: 3652

Page 5

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Charles A. Fox whose telephone number is 703-605-

4294. The examiner can normally be reached between 7:00-5:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Eileen D. Lillis can be reached at 703-308-3248. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-

1113.

EILEEN D. LILLIS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

la lilio

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3000

CAF

CAF

12-29-03